

### **REMARKS**

This paper is in response to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment dated September 20, 2007. In the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment the Examiner stated the Response to Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment dated July 11, 2007 failed to include a complete listing of all claims and did not include the material included in the Amendment filed April 11, 2007. Applicants respectfully submit that this Amendment address all the items listed in the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendments dated June 29, 2007 and September 20, 2007 and the Office Action dated January 11, 2007.

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-16 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 11, and 16 are independent. In the Office Action dated January 11, 2007, Claims 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101, Claims 12-14 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Claims 1-2, 5-10, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), and Claims 3-4, 11, and 14-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1-20 remain in this application with new claims 17-20 being added by this amendment. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

#### **I. Interview Summary**

Applicants thank Examiner Ho for the courtesy of a telephone interview on March 22, 2007, requested by the undersigned to discuss the rejection of the current claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(a). During the interview, Applicants presented arguments rebutting the rejection. No agreement was reached regarding patentability.

II. Rejection of Claim 9 Under 35 U.S.C. §101

In the Office Action dated January 11, 2007, the Examiner rejected Claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 9 has been amended and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment overcomes this rejection and adds no new matter.

III. Rejection of Claims 12-14 and 16 Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 12-14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 12-14 and 16 have been amended and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

IV. Rejection of Claims 1-2, 5-10, and 16 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-2, 5-10, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Zdun 2002 Publication ("*Zdun*"). Claims 1 and 16 have been amended and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "accessing a specification file associated with the web part, wherein the specification file comprises data indicating whether the web part should be modified" and "modifying the presentation of the web part in accordance with the specification file and the data indicating whether the web part should be modified to

provide a modified presentation as at least part of the customized web part.” Claim 16 includes a similar recitation. Support for this amendment to Claim 1 can be found in the specification at least on page 26, line 33-page 27 line 4.

In contrast, *Zdun* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitations. For example, *Zdun* merely discloses “pool pages” that are web objects containing business logic described in data objects. (See section 3, ¶ 1.) The pool pages are used to display a set of similar data objects. (See section 3, ¶ 1.) In *Zdun*, pool pages aggregate user interface builder objects to construct HTML/XML pages using a generic interface. (See section 3, ¶ 2.) *Zdun* states that parsers are customized for special XML representations. (See section 4, ¶ 3.) The customized parsers in *Zdun* are not easily written by non-programmers therefore simple GUIs or web-based text editors are written to allow the XML text to be edited. (See section 4, ¶ 3.) Consequently, *Zdun* does not disclose accessing a specification file indicating whether a web part should be modified. Rather *Zdun* merely discloses GUIs or web-based text editors being written to edit XML text. Moreover, *Zdun* is completely silent regarding modifying the web part based on data from the specification file.

*Zdun* does not anticipate the claimed invention because *Zdun* at least does not disclose “accessing a specification file associated with the web part, wherein the specification file comprises data indicating whether the web part should be modified” and “modifying the presentation of the web part in accordance with the specification file and the data indicating whether the web part should be modified to provide a modified presentation as at least part of the customized web part,” as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claim 16 includes a recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 16

each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1 and 16.

Dependent Claims 2-10 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claim 1, and by virtue of their dependency upon independent Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2-10.

V. Rejection of Claims 11 and 14-15 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 11 and 14-15, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Zdun* in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,993,569 ("*Rees*"). Claim 11 has been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment overcomes this rejection and adds no new matter.

Amended Claim 11 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "the specification file comprises data indicating whether the web part should be modified" and "a processing device responsive to the code and data indicating whether the web part should be modified in the specification file for modifying the web part presentation." Support for this amendment can be found in the specification at least on page 26, line 33-page 27 line 4.

In contrast, and as stated above, *Zdun* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitation. For example, *Zdun* merely discloses "pool pages" that are web objects containing business logic described in data objects. (See section 3, ¶ 1.) The pool pages are used to display a set of similar data objects. (See section 3, ¶ 1.) In *Zdun*, pool pages aggregate user interface builder objects to construct HTML/XML pages using a generic interface. (See section 3, ¶ 2.) *Zdun* states that parsers are

customized for special XML representations. (See section 4, ¶ 3.) These customized parsers in *Zdun* are not easily written by non-programmers therefore simple GUIs or web-based text editors are written to allow the XML text to be edited. (See section 4, ¶ 3.) Consequently, *Zdun* does not disclose accessing a specification file indicating whether a web part should be modified. Rather *Zdun* merely discloses GUIs or web-based text editors being written to edit XML text. Moreover, *Zdun* is completely silent regarding modifying the web part based on data from the specification file.

Furthermore, *Rees* does not overcome *Zdun*'s deficiencies. *Rees* merely discloses generating data and transmitting an executable to a remote location over a network. (See col. 1, lines 40-43.) In *Rees*, the data is generated while the executable is being transmitted. (See col. 1, lines 43-44.) By generating part of the data while the executable is being transmitted, *Rees* reduces a delay or latency before the executable and the data arrive at the remote location. (See col. 1, lines 45-48.) The reduction in the delay in *Rees* makes the method more responsive to a user. (See col. 1, lines 48-49.) Consequently, *Reese* does not disclose accessing a specification file indicating whether a web part should be modified because *Reese* discloses generating data while the data is in transit. *Reese* is completely silent regarding modifying the web part based on data from the specification file.

Combining *Zdun* with *Rees* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Zdun* or *Rees*, either individually or in any reasonable combination, at least do not disclose "the specification file comprises data indicating whether the web part should be modified" and "a processing device responsive to the code and the data indicating whether the web part should be modified in the specification file for modifying the web

part presentation,” as recited by amended Claim 11. Accordingly, independent Claim 11 patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claim 11.

Dependent Claims 12-15 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claim 11, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claim 11. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 12-15.

VI. Rejection of Claims 3-4 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 3-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Zdun* in view of *Houghton*. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent Claims 3-4 are allowable at least for the reasons described in the Amendment filed April 11, 2007 (see page 9, lines 20-23) regarding independent Claim 1, and by virtue of their dependency upon independent Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 3-4.

Specifically, the Examiner stated the Amendment filed April 11, 2007 fails to address the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent Claim 3-4 based on *Zdun* in view of *Houghton*. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent Claims 3-4 are allowable at least for the reasons described in the Amendment filed April 11, 2007 (see page 9, lines 20-23) regarding independent Claim 1, and by virtue of their dependency upon independent Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 3-4.

#### VII. Rejection of Claims 12-13 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 3-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Zdun* in view of *Rees* and in further view of *Houghton*. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent Claims 12-13 are allowable at least for the reasons described in the Amendment filed April 11, 2007 (see page 11, line 22-page 12, line 2) regarding independent Claim 11, and by virtue of their dependency upon independent Claim 11. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 12-13.

#### VIII. New Claims 17-20

New Claims 17-20 have been added by this amendment. Support for new Claims 17-20 can be found in the specification at least on page 8, lines 25-29. Applicants respectfully submit that new Claims 17-20 are allowable and add no new matter.

#### IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements

reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,  
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903  
404.954.5066

/D. Kent Stier/

Date: October 19, 2007

---

D. Kent Stier  
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:ARL:mdc

